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Compilers Must Uphold HLL Guarantees

- Compiler translates HLL statements into assembly instructions
- Code generated by compiler must provide functionality required by HLL program
Compilers Must Uphold HLL Guarantees

C11 Program

\[x.\text{store}(1);\]
\[r1 = y.\text{load}();\]

C/C++11 standards introduced atomic operations
   - Portable, high-performance concurrent code

• Compiler uses **mapping** to translate from atomic ops to assembly instructions

X86 Assembly Language Program

\[\text{mov [eax], 1}\]
\[\text{MFENCE}\]
\[\text{mov ebx, [ebx]}\]
Compilers Must Uphold HLL Guarantees

C11 Program

\[ \text{x.store}(1); \]
\[ \text{r1 = y.load}(); \]

X86 C11 Atomic Mapping

\[ \text{mov [eax], 1} \]
\[ \text{MFENCE} \]
\[ \text{mov ebx, [ebx]} \]

X86 Assembly Language Program

If mapping is correct, then for all programs:

C11 Outcome
Forbidden

implies

ISA-Level Outcome
Forbidden
Exploring Mappings with TriCheck

C11 Litmus Test Variants → C11 Atomic Mapping → ISA-level litmus tests

How do HLL outcomes compare to ISA-level outcomes?

C11 Outcomes = ISA-Level Outcomes
Exploring Mappings with TriCheck

If a mapping is correct, then for all programs:

C11 Litmus Test Variants → C11 Atomic Mapping → ISA-level litmus tests

Herd

C11 Outcome Forbidden implies ISA-Level Outcome Forbidden

C11 Outcome Forbidden

μCheck
Counterexamples Detected!

C11 Litmus Test Variants

\( \text{C11} \rightarrow \text{Power/ARMv7} \)

Trailing-Sync Atomic Mapping

Power/ARMv7-like litmus tests

Herd

C11 Outcome Forbidden

\[ \text{but} \]

\( \text{μCheck} \)

ISA-Level Outcome Allowed
Counterexamples Detected!

• Counterexample implies mapping is flawed
• But mapping previously proven correct [Batty et al. POPL 2012]
• Must be an error in the proof!
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C11 Memory Model

- C11 memory model specifies a C11 program’s allowed and forbidden outcomes
- Axiomatic model defined in terms of program executions
  - Executions that satisfy C11 axioms are consistent
  - Executions that do not satisfy axioms are forbidden
  - Outcome only allowed if consistent execution exists
- C11 axioms defined in terms of various relations on an execution
**C11 atomic operations**

- Used to write portable, high-performance concurrent code
- Atomic ops can have different memory orders
  - seq_cst, acquire, release, relaxed ...
  - Stronger guarantees: easier correctness, lower performance
  - Weaker guarantees: harder correctness, higher performance
- Example ($y$ is an atomic variable):
  ```c
  y.store(1, memory_order_release);
  int b = y.load(memory_order_acquire);
  ```
Relevant C11 Memory Model Relations

• Happens-before (hb) = (sb U sw)⁺
  – Transitive closure of statement order and synchronization order

• Total order on SC operations (sc)
  – Must be acyclic
  – sc edges must not be in opposite direction to hb edges (sc must be “consistent with” hb)
  – SC read operations cannot read from overwritten writes
Power and ARMv7 Compiler Mappings

- Trailing-sync mapping:
  - [Boehm 2011][Batty et al. POPL 2012]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C/C++ Atomic</th>
<th>Power Mapping</th>
<th>ARMv7 Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load Acquire</td>
<td>ld; cmp; bc; isync</td>
<td>ldr; teq; beq; isb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Seq Cst</td>
<td>ld; sync</td>
<td>ldr; dmb ish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Release</td>
<td>lwsync; st</td>
<td>dmb ish; str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Seq Cst</td>
<td>lwsync; st; sync</td>
<td>dmb ish; dmb ish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Power lwsync and ARMv7 dmb prior to releases ensure that prior accesses are made visible before the release.
Power and ARMv7 Compiler Mappings

• Trailing-sync mapping:
  – [Boehm 2011][Batty et al. POPL 2012]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C/C++ Atomic</th>
<th>Power Mapping</th>
<th>ARMv7 Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load Acquire</td>
<td>ld; cmp; bc; isync</td>
<td>ldr; teq; beq; isb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Seq Cst</td>
<td>ld; sync</td>
<td>ldr; dmb ish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Release</td>
<td>lwsync; st</td>
<td>dmb ish; str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Seq Cst</td>
<td>lwsync; st, sync</td>
<td>dmb ish; str, dmb ish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Power ctrlisync/sync and ARMv7 ctrlisb/dmb after acquires enforce that subsequent accesses are made visible after the acquire.

Use of sync/dmb for SC loads helps enforce the required C11 total order on SC operations.
Power and ARMv7 Compiler Mappings

• Trailing-sync mapping:
  – [Boehm 2011][Batty et al. POPL 2012]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C/C++ Atomic</th>
<th>Power Mapping</th>
<th>ARMv7 Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load Acquire</td>
<td>ld; cmp; bc; isync</td>
<td>ldr; teq; beq; isb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Seq Cst</td>
<td>ld; sync</td>
<td>ldr; dmb ish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Release</td>
<td>lwsync; st</td>
<td>dmb ish; str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Seq Cst</td>
<td>lwsync; st; sync</td>
<td>dmb ish; str; dmb ish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Power sync and ARMv7 dmb after SC stores (“trailing-sync”) prevent reordering with subsequent SC loads

Ostensibly, this ordering can also be enforced by putting fences before SC loads...
Power and ARMv7 Compiler Mappings

• Leading-sync mapping:
  – [McKenney and Silvera 2011]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C/C++ Atomic</th>
<th>Power Mapping</th>
<th>ARMv7 Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load Acquire</td>
<td>ld; cmp; bc; isync</td>
<td>ldr; teq; beq; isb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Seq Cst</td>
<td>sync; ld; cmp; bc; isync</td>
<td>dmb ish; ldr; teq; beq; isb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Release</td>
<td>lwsync; st</td>
<td>dmb ish; str</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Seq Cst</td>
<td>sync; st</td>
<td>dmb ish; str</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leading-sync mapping places these fences *before* SC loads

Only translations of SC atomics change between the two mappings
Both Mappings are Currently Invalid

• Both supposedly proven correct [Batty et al. POPL 2012]

• We discovered two counterexamples to trailing-sync mappings on Power and ARMv7
  – Isolated the proof loophole that allowed flaw

• Vafeiadis et al. found counterexamples for leading-sync mapping, and have proposed solution
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IRIW Trailing-Sync Counterexample

T0                     T1                     T2                     T3
x.store(1, seq_cst);  y.store(1, seq_cst);  r1 = x.load(acquire);  r3 = y.load(acquire);
                      r2 = y.load(seq_cst);  r4 = x.load(seq_cst);

Outcome: r1 = 1, r2 = 0, r3 = 1, r4 = 0

• Variant of IRIW (Independent-Reads-Independent-Writes) litmus test
• IRIW corresponds to two cores observing stores to different addresses in different orders
• At least one of first loads on T2 and T3 is an acquire; all other accesses are SC
IRIW Counterexample Compilation

\begin{align*}
\text{T0} & \quad \text{T1} & \quad \text{T2} & \quad \text{T3} \\
\text{x.store(1, seq\_cst)}; & \quad \text{y.store(1, seq\_cst)}; & \quad \text{r1 = x.load(acquire)}; & \quad \text{r3 = y.load(acquire)}; \\
& & \quad \text{r2 = y.load(seq\_cst)}; & \quad \text{r4 = x.load(seq\_cst)};
\end{align*}

Outcome: \( r1 = 1, \ r2 = 0, \ r3 = 1, \ r4 = 0 \)

With trailing sync mapping, effectively compiles down to

\begin{align*}
\text{C0} & \quad \text{C1} & \quad \text{C2} & \quad \text{C3} \\
\text{St x = 1} & \quad \text{St y = 1} & \quad \text{r1 = Ld x} & \quad \text{r3 = Ld y} \\
& & \quad \text{ctrlisync/ctrlisb} & \quad \text{ctrlisync/ctrlisb} \\
& & \quad \text{r2 = Ld y} & \quad \text{r4 = Ld x}
\end{align*}

\textbf{Allowed by Power model and hardware [Alglave et al. TOPLAS 2014]} \\
\textbf{Allowed by ARMv7 model [Alglave et al. TOPLAS 2014]}

IRIW Counterexample Compilation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T0</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x.store(1, seq_cst);</td>
<td>y.store(1, seq_cst);</td>
<td>r1 = x.load(acquire);</td>
<td>r3 = y.load(acquire);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r2 = y.load(seq_cst);</td>
<td>r4 = x .load(seq_cst);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome: r1 = 1, r2 = 0, r3 = 1, r4 = 0

With **trailing sync** mapping, effectively compiles down to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St x = 1</td>
<td>St y = 1</td>
<td>r1 = Ld x</td>
<td>r3 = Ld y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ctrlisync/ctrlisb</strong></td>
<td><strong>ctrlisync/ctrlisb</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r2 = Ld y</td>
<td>r4 = Ld x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ctrlisync/ctrlisb** are not strong enough to forbid outcome

*Allowed by Power model and hardware* [Alglave et al. TOPLAS 2014]

*Allowed by ARMv7 model* [Alglave et al. TOPLAS 2014]
IRIW Trailing-Sync Counterexample

Outcome: r1 = 1, r2 = 0, r3 = 1, r4 = 0

Happens-before edges from c → f and from d → h by transitivity
IRIW Trailing-Sync Counterexample

T0                                           T1                                           T2                                           T3
x.store(1, seq_cst); y.store(1, seq_cst);   r1 = x.load(acquire);   r3 = y.load(acquire);   r2 = y.load(seq_cst);   r4 = x.load(seq_cst);

Outcome: r1 = 1, r2 = 0, r3 = 1, r4 = 0

Happens-before edges from c → f and from d → h by transitivity
IRIW Trailing-Sync Counterexample

T0                                    T1                                              T2                                   T3
x.store(1, seq_cst);  y.store(1, seq_cst);    r1 = x.load(acquire);  r3 = y.load(acquire);
                          r2 = y.load(seq_cst);    r4 = x.load(seq_cst);

Outcome: r1 = 1, r2 = 0, r3 = 1, r4 = 0

Happens-before edges from c → f and from d → h by transitivity
IRIW Trailing-Sync Counterexample

• SC order must contain edges from \( c \to f \) and from \( d \to h \) to match direction of hb edges

• Shown below as \( sc \_ hb \) edges
IRIW Trailing-Sync Counterexample

- SC reads \( f \) and \( h \) must read from non-SC writes \( b \) and \( a \) before they are overwritten.
- The SC order must contain \( f \rightarrow d \) and \( h \rightarrow c \) to satisfy this condition.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c: } Wsc \ x &= 1 \\
\text{d: } Wsc \ y &= 1 \\
\text{f: } Rsc \ y &= 0 \\
\text{h: } Rsc \ x &= 0
\end{align*}
\]
IRIW Trailing-Sync Counterexample

• SC reads \( f \) and \( h \) must read from non-SC writes \( b \) and \( a \) before they are overwritten

• Cycle in the SC order
• Outcome is **forbidden** as there is no corresponding consistent execution
• But compiled code **allows** the behaviour!
What went wrong?

- SC axioms required SC order to contain edges from $c \to f$ and from $d \to h$ to match direction of $hb$ edges.
- This requires a `sync/dmb`ish between $e$ and $f$ as well as between $g$ and $h$ on Power and ARMv7.
- These fences are **NOT** provided by trailing-sync mapping.
What went wrong?

• SC axioms required SC order to contain edges from $c \rightarrow f$ and from $d \rightarrow h$ to match direction of $hb$ edges
• This requires a `sync/dmb` ish between $e$ and $f$ as well as between $g$ and $h$ on Power and ARMv7
• These fences are **NOT** provided by trailing-sync mapping
What went wrong?

- SC axioms required SC order to contain edges from $c \rightarrow f$ and from $d \rightarrow h$ to match direction of hb edges.
- This requires a \textit{sync/dmb ish} between $e$ and $f$ as well as between $g$ and $h$ on Power and ARMv7.
- These fences are \textbf{NOT} provided by trailing-sync mapping.
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Loophole in Batty et al. proof [POPL 2012]

- Lemma in proof states that SC order for a given Power trace is an arbitrary linearization of 
  \[(po_{t}^{sc} \cup co_{t}^{sc} \cup fr_{t}^{sc} \cup erf_{t}^{sc})^*\]

- This is the transitive closure of program order and coherence edges \textbf{directly} between SC accesses

- Proof clause checking C11 axiom that \(sc\) and \(hb\) edges match direction states that having SC order be arbitrary linearization of above relation is sufficient
Loophole in Batty et al. proof [POPL 2012]

• This claim is **false** in certain scenarios
• *hb* edges can arise between SC accesses through the transitive composition of edges to and from a non-SC **intermediate** access
• Occurs in IRIW counterexample:

\[
\begin{align*}
c: Wsc\ x=1 \\
d: Wsc\ y=1 \\
e: Racq\ x=1 \\
sb \\
f: Rsc\ y=0
\end{align*}
\]
Loophole in Batty et al. proof [POPL 2012]

• This claim is **false** in certain scenarios
• $hb$ edges can arise between SC accesses through the transitive composition of edges to and from a non-SC **intermediate** access
• Occurs in IRIW counterexample:
Loophole in Batty et al. proof [POPL 2012]

• SC order must be in same direction as these $hb$ edges, but an arbitrary linearization of $(po_t^{sc} \cup co_t^{sc} \cup fr_t^{sc} \cup erf_t^{sc})^*$ may not satisfy this condition

• Result: Proof does not guarantee that $sc$ and $hb$ edges match direction between two accesses, and is incorrect
  – confirmed by Batty et al.
Current Compiler and Architecture State

• Neither GCC nor Clang implement exact flawed trailing-sync mapping
  – Use leading-sync mapping for Power
  – Use trailing-sync for ARMv7, but with stronger acquire mapping (ld; dmb ish or stronger)
  – Sufficient to disallow both our counterexamples

• Both counterexample behaviours observed on Power hardware [Alglave et al. TOPLAS 2014]
• ARMv7 model [Alglave et al. TOPLAS 2014] allows counterexample behaviours, but not observed on ARMv7 hardware
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What about optimizations?

- Even if mapping is correct, optimizations cannot introduce new outcomes
- Recent work on src-to-src opts and LLVM IR verification
  - [Vafeiadis et al. POPL 2015]
  - [Chakraborty and Vafeiadis CGO 2016]
- What about commercial compilers?
XL C++ Bugs Overview

• Visited IBM Yorktown Heights to check if XL C++ (v13.1.4) was vulnerable to trailing-sync counterexample

• XL C++ mapping close to leading-sync

• Often correct at lower optimization levels, but increasing optimizations to –O3 and –O4 generated incorrect code for multiple tests

• Bugs have since been fixed by compiler team
  – Caused by issues in code generator
  – Fixes in v13.1.5
Bug #1: Loss of SC Store Release Semantics

“Message-passing” litmus test (mp), relaxed store of x, all other accesses SC

\[\begin{align*}
\text{T0} & & \text{T1} \\
x.\text{store}(1, \text{relaxed}); & r1 = y.\text{load}(\text{seq}\_\text{cst}); \\
y.\text{store}(1, \text{seq}\_\text{cst}); & r2 = x.\text{load}(\text{seq}\_\text{cst});
\end{align*}\]

Outcome: \(r1 = 1, r2 = 0\) (Forbidden by C++)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{XL C++ with } \text{–O3} \text{ compiles to:} \\
\text{C0} & \text{ St } x = 1 \\
\text{ sync} & \text{ St } y = 1 \\
\text{ C1} & \text{ sync} \\
& r1 = \text{Ld } y \\
& \text{ctrlisync (twice)} \\
& \text{ sync} \\
& r2 = \text{Ld } x \\
& \text{ctrlisync (twice)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{XL C++ with } \text{–O4} \text{ compiles to:} \\
\text{C0} & \text{ St } x = 1 \\
& \text{ctrlisync} \\
\text{ C1} & \text{ St } y = 1 \\
& \text{sync} \\
& \text{ctrlisync} \\
& \text{ sync} \\
& r2 = \text{Ld } x \\
& \text{sync}
\end{align*}\]

Forbidden

Allowed

Used litmus utility to exercise outcome of incorrect code
Bug #1: Loss of SC Store Release Semantics

“Message-passing” litmus test (mp), relaxed store of x, all other accesses SC

\[
\begin{align*}
T0 & \quad T1 \\
\text{x.store(1, relaxed);} & \quad r1 = \text{y.load(seq_cst);} \\
\text{y.store(1, seq_cst);} & \quad r2 = \text{x.load(seq_cst);} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Outcome: \(r1 = 1, r2 = 0\) (Forbidden by C++)

XL C++ with –O3 compiles to:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{C0} & \quad \text{C1} \\
\text{St x = 1} & \quad \text{sync} \\
\text{sync} & \quad r1 = \text{Ld y} \\
\text{St y = 1} & \quad \text{ctrlisync (twice)} \\
\text{} & \quad \text{sync} \\
\text{} & \quad r2 = \text{Ld x} \\
\text{} & \quad \text{ctrlisync (twice)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

XL C++ with –O4 compiles to:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{C0} & \quad \text{C1} \\
\text{St x = 1} & \quad \text{ctrlisync} \\
\text{} & \quad r1 = \text{Ld y} \\
\text{sync} & \quad \text{ctrlisync} \\
\text{St y = 1} & \quad \text{sync} \\
\text{} & \quad r2 = \text{Ld x} \\
\text{} & \quad \text{sync} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Bug: Ctrlisync is not strong enough to ensure stores are observed in order

Forbidden

Allowed

Used litmus utility to exercise outcome of incorrect code
Bug #2: Incorrect Impl. of Releases

“Message-passing” litmus test (mp), with release-acquire atomics, relaxed store of x

\[
\begin{array}{l}
T0 & \qquad T1 \\
\text{x.store}(1, \text{relaxed}); & \text{r1} = \text{y.load}(\text{acquire}); \\
\text{y.store}(1, \text{release}); & \text{r2} = \text{x.load}(\text{acquire}); \\
\end{array}
\]

**Outcome:** \( \text{r1} = 1, \text{r2} = 0 \) (Forbidden by C++)

**XL C++ with \texttt{-O3} compiles to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{C0}</th>
<th>\textbf{C1}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St ( x = 1 )</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St ( y = 1 )</td>
<td>r1 = Ld ( y )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2 = Ld ( x )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowed**

Used **litmus** utility to exercise outcome of incorrect code
Bug #2: Incorrect Impl. of Releases

“Message-passing” litmus test (mp), with release-acquire atomics, relaxed store of x

\[
\begin{align*}
T0 & \quad T1 \\
x.\text{store}(1, \text{relaxed}); & \quad r1 = y.\text{load}(\text{acquire}); \\
y.\text{store}(1, \text{release}); & \quad r2 = x.\text{load}(\text{acquire});
\end{align*}
\]

Outcome: \( r1 = 1, r2 = 0 \) (Forbidden by C++)

**XL C++ with –O3 compiles to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St x = 1</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St y = 1</td>
<td>r1 = Ld y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2 = Ld x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bug: No ordering enforcement between stores

Allowed

Used **litmus** utility to exercise outcome of incorrect code
Bug #3: Reordering SC Loads and \textit{syncs}

IRIW litmus test with two acquire loads, all other accesses SC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T0</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x.store(1, seq_cst); y.store(1, seq_cst);</td>
<td>r1 = x.load(acquire);</td>
<td>r3 = y.load(acquire);</td>
<td>r2 = y.load(seq_cst); r4 = x.load(seq_cst);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome: \(r1 = 1, r2 = 0, r3 = 1, r4 = 0\) (Forbidden by C++)

XL C++ with \(-O3\) compiles to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St x = 1</td>
<td>St y = 1</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r1 = Ld x</td>
<td>r3 = Ld y</td>
<td>sync</td>
<td>sync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2 = Ld y</td>
<td>r4 = Ld x</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forbidden

XL C++ with \(-O4\) compiles to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St x = 1</td>
<td>St y = 1</td>
<td>r1 = Ld x</td>
<td>r3 = Ld y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sync</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
<td>r2 = Ld y</td>
<td>sync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
<td>r4 = Ld x</td>
<td>sync</td>
<td>ctrlisync</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allowed
Bug #3: Reordering SC Loads and \textsf{sync}s

IRIW litmus test with two acquire loads, all other accesses SC

\begin{align*}
\text{T0} & \quad \text{T1} & \quad \text{T2} & \quad \text{T3} \\
\text{x.store}(1, \text{seq\_cst}); & \quad \text{y.store}(1, \text{seq\_cst}); & \quad \text{r1} = \text{x.load}(\text{acquire}); & \quad \text{r3} = \text{y.load}(\text{acquire}); \\
& & \quad \text{r2} = \text{y.load}(\text{seq\_cst}); & \quad \text{r4} = \text{x.load}(\text{seq\_cst});
\end{align*}

Outcome: $r1 = 1$, $r2 = 0$, $r3 = 1$, $r4 = 0$ (Forbidden by C++)

XL C++ with \textemdash\text{-O3} compiles to:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{C0} & \text{C1} & \text{C2} & \text{C3} \\
\text{St x = 1} & \text{St y = 1} & \text{ctrlisync} & \text{ctrlisync} \\
\text{r1 = Ld x} & \text{r3 = Ld y} & \text{sync} & \text{sync} \\
\text{r2 = Ld y} & \text{r4 = Ld x} & \text{ctrlisync} & \text{ctrlisync} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Forbidden

XL C++ with \textemdash\text{-O4} compiles to:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{C0} & \text{C1} & \text{C2} & \text{C3} \\
\text{ctrlisync} & \text{ctrlisync} & \text{r1 = Ld x} & \text{r3 = Ld y} \\
\text{St x = 1} & \text{St y = 1} & \text{ctrlisync} & \text{ctrlisync} \\
\text{r2 = Ld y} & \text{r4 = Ld x} & \text{sync} & \text{sync} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Allowed

\textbf{Bug: Ctrlisync is not enough to enforce required orderings}
Future Work

• XL C++ bugs show that it is particularly hard to maintain C11 orderings across optimizations

• Need a top-to-bottom verification flow from HLL to assembly code, incorporating compiler optimizations
  – Avenue for future work
Conclusions

• TriCheck provides rapid exploration of different compiler mappings for architectures across C11 litmus test variants

• Using TriCheck, discovered two trailing-sync counterexamples for Power and ARMv7
  – Also discovered loophole in proof of mappings
  – Either C11 model or mappings must change to enable correct compilation

• Experiments with IBM XL C++ revealed bugs (since fixed) in their C11 implementation
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